RAJYA SABHA

Wednesday, the 26th April, 1989/the 6th Vaisakha, 1911 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the Clock, **Mr. Chairman** in the Chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Cooperation of EEC to Combat Terrorism

*41. SHRI HARVENDRA SINGH HANSPAL:

SHRI SHIV PRATAP MISHRA:†

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the European Economic Community (EEC) has expressed its willingness to cooperate with India in combating terrorism;

(b) whether Government have since taken any decision to take the help of the EEC to combat terrorism in the country; and

(c) if so, what are the details in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): (a) The question of cooperation between India and the EEC in the matter of combating international terrorism with particular reference to the activities and free movement of Sikh extremists in Western Europe was discussed at the Indo-EEC Political Dialogue held at the Troika Ministerial level. The EEC side expressed its readiness in principle for such cooperation, but the Interior Ministers of the European Council will have to further consider the modalities and specific mechanism for such cooperation.

(b) and (c) The proposal for cooperation with the EEC does not envisage any action to combat terrorism within India.

SHRI SHIV PRATAP MISHRA: What are the names of the EEC countries with which India has extradition tradition treaties? Does the Government propose to have extradition treaties with the EEC countries with which it does not have such treaties?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We had a discussion on an institutional level with the EEC group of Ministers. The first meeting was in Bonn in June 1988 and the most recent was on the 28th of March 1989. As you know, there is a group of the EEC called the Travai Group which deals with the question. We are also, on a bilateral basis, dealing, on this issue, with the United Kingdom, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece and Spain. With regard to the extradition treaty, this does not fall within the scope of this question.

SHRI SHIV PRATAP MISHRA: I would like to know whether the Government are aware of the study conducted by the State Department of the USA according to which organisations like Abu Nidal and Japanese Red Army have allegedly committed acts of terrorism in India and whether view of the growing worldwide concern of combating terrorists activities, the Government would seek the help of other countries, especially the countries of Asia, such as, the SAARC countries, to combat terrorism in India.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We have also had a dialogue on this very important issue with the United States Government. As the hon. Member might recollect, at one time ... *(Interruption)*

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Shiv Pratap Mishra.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Is that report true? That is what he wants to know. Is it true that Abu Nidal and Japanese Red Army have infiltrated into India? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, with regard to the two items that are mentioned here, we are dealing with the specific question that the hon. Member has asked with regard to the EEC and the cooperation with India. I would like to confine myself in this particular matter. This has very wide ramifications. All that I can say is, the Governmest is aware of the perils that terrorism produces both within and outside India and it is our effort to be in touch with Governments whenever they be and to arrive at some kind of an arrangement, both bilateral and institutional, where we can take care of this menace, It is not confined to any particular part of India, but it is a worldwide problem.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He has avoided the question whether Abu Nidal and Japanese Red Army are involved or not.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: This is a matter on which I really cannot comment. It is for the Ministry of Home Affairs. They can ask another question and they will give them an authoritative answer.

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल: चेयरमैन महोदय, इस बात की खुशी है कि भारत सरकार ने पहले पाकिस्तान के साथ, जहां से आतंकवाद को, एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट को बढ़ावा दिया जा रहा है, हथियार दिए जा रहे हैं, उनसे बातचीत की और मैं ऐसा समझता हूं कि उसका कुछ न कुछ फायदा जरूर पहुंचा है. अभी पूरा तो नहीं पहुंचा । इस बात की और खुशी है कि ई० ई० सी० कट्रीज के साथ भारत सरकार ने डायलॉग किया । मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इस डायलॉग का स्कोप क्या है ? उसका हमें कोई इम्मीडियेट बेनीफिट पहुंचा या नहीं पहुंचा या फ्यूचर में हमें उसका क्या बेनीफिट जल्दी मिलने वाला है ? इस सवाल में भी यह पूछा गया है, आप के जवाब में भी है कि बहुत से लोग, इसमें तो आपने सीधा लिख दिया कि सिख टेरोरिस्ट वहां घूम रहे हैं । मैं इस बात से मैं पूरी तौर से सहमत नहीं । लेकिन मैं यह जरूर जानना चाहूंगा हूं कि सिखों के भेस वहां जो एक्सट्रीमिस्ट घूम रहे हैं, उनमें उनको रोकने के लिए क्या फायदा पहुंचेगा ?

श्री के० नटवर सिंह: देखिए साहब, जैसा मैंने बताया कि यह जो सवाल हैं, एक तो देखिए दो तरफा होता है । कुछ देशों के साथ जैसा मैंने कहा ब्रिटेन के साथ, जर्मनी के साथ, फ्रांस के साथ स्पेन के साथ और दूसरा पहलू है अंतर्राष्ट्रीय और जैसा आप जानते हैं कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में, नान-डअलाइण्ड समिट में, कामनवेल्थ में, सार्क में इस विषय पर काफी सालों से बात-चीत हो रही है । कुछ फैसले लिए गए हैं, कुछ प्रस्ताव पास किए गए हैं और सभी देश चाहते है कि यह जो आतंकवादी हैं, जो उन्होंने खतरा पैदा किया है हमारे देश के लिए, उसके लिए कड़े से कड़े कानून बनाए जाए और इसमें कोई मतभेद नहीं है । इसके लिए जैसा आप ने अभी फरमाया कि पाकिस्तान से भी हमारी बात-चीत हुई है और उसमें थोड़ा बहुत फर्क मालूम हुआ है, पूरी तौर से तो नहीं । अभी हमारे गृह मंत्रालय के सचिव पाकिस्तान के गृह मंत्रालय के सचिव से बात-चीत करेंगे, खास तौर से इस सवाल पर ।

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल: चेयरमैन महोदय, इस से पहले कि मैं एक छोटा सा क्वेश्चन और करूं, मैंने यह आप से खास तौर से कहा कि आपने अपने जवाब में सिख एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट की बात कहे; यह शब्द ऐसा इस्तेमाल नहीं होना चाहिए मैंने इसलिए कहा था कि सिखों के भेस में जो लोग वहां घूमते हैं यह जरूरी नहीं कहा जा सकता कि वे सिख धर्म के आदमी हैं या नहीं । तो आइन्दा अगर ऐसा शब्द न इस्तेमाल किया जाए तो वह अच्छा रहेगा ।

श्री के० नटवर सिंह: ठीक है, इस पर जरूर गौर किया जाएगा । ... (*व्यवधान*)

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : जो स्पेन के एक्सटर्नल अफेयर मिनिस्टर फ्रन्सिसको ने भारत में अपनी प्रैस कान्फ्रेंस में कहा कि he would put forward the Indian proposal to his colleagues in Tel Aviv to study the possibilities of establishing channel for cooperation to tackle...

उन्होंने भी सिख टेरोरिज्म का ही नाम लिया है यहां पर। तो क्या उन्होंने वहां पर जा कर कोई कार्रवाई इस सिलसिले में की है या नहीं ?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We have not heard from him since he has left. He assured us that the modalities for arranging for a channel of communication with the Government of India would be looked into. I would certainly send them a reminder. With regard to the use of a particular word, I take care of what the honourable Member has said. Not once did our Government say that every Sikh is an extremist or terrorist; not at all. They are a small group of people. I will certainly see if we can find some word which takes care of the worries and sensibilities of the honourable Member.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: My question is that all the Sikhs in that area are first considered as terrorists and then you specify who is not a terrorist. Have you specified who the terrorists are and those are the people that these countries are supposed to look after or keep their eye on? From your statement that is made, 'Sikh terrorists' is not written on their face. You specify and give that information and tell them who the terrorists are. Otherwise every Sikh would be called a terrorist. Can you please clarify?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I appreciate what you say and we will definitely...

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: No, no. I wanted to know specifically whether you have identified certain people who are there and who are terrorists known to you or whether it is a general term that you say, "Please keep everyone under observation."

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: No. We have a fairly good idea of the particular individuals who are actively involved in this and the Government has those names from the Governments of the countries with which we are dealing with this problem. As I have said earlier, I want to reiterate that never has the Government said that all Sikhs are terrorists or extremists. Not at all. I want to reiterate this quite clearly, categorically and unambiguously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Bansal.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, though there is a perceptible change in the attitude of some of the European countries towards the issues confronting India, yet we find that the activities of some of the groups of Indians settled abroad continue unabated in extending all possible assistance to the terrorists operating in Punjab and elsewhere in our country. Recently, there was a report that in a suburb of London, there was a meeting held at which some representatives of the Mujahideen also assured all support to the terrorists here. I would like to know from the honourable Minister whether this matter has been taken up with the Government of the UK and, if so, what was their response thereto?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We have taken up this matter with the UK Government and as soon as we hear from them, we will let the House know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I would like to seek certain clarifications from the honourable Minister of State

for External Affairs. Between India and the EEC, has there been any discussion on this question of terrorists? Would the honourable Minister explain whether collectively, as it is, or bilaterally, between individual countries, that is, between India and the EEC or between India and the various constituent countries of the EEC, is there an accepted definition of terrorism? Is there a common understanding on who a terrorist is and what terrorism is? I am asking this because unless that base is there, I do not think the talks would be of any great use. Would the honourable Minister of State, therefore, clarify whether there is an accepted definition of terrorism?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I do not know what the specific definition is. But I do know that at the UN and in the Commonwealth and in the NAM and in the SAARC, we have...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not asking about the UN or the NAM or the SAARC. The question is specifically about the EEC, about the accepted definition between the constituent countries. Do they accept what we mean by terrorism? Is there a commonly understood definition of terrorism?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I appreciate what the honourable Member has said and I appreciate his feel for the language and this desire for precision. If we are going to waste a great deal of time in defining what terrorism is or who a terrorist is, then I think the international organisations can go on like this till kingdom comes. But the fact is that there is a threat and we discuss this. So far nobody in the world has questioned who a terrorist is. Legally we can argue about it, argue about what terrorism is. But everybody knows what it means. If there is a question from the EEC we will certainly sit down and discuss with them. I do not think the definition of terrorism should delay the action on a bilateral or multilateral level to deal with this problem; I do not think that is an important issue.

श्रीमती शान्ति पहाड़िया : श्रीमन्, मैं मंत्री जी से एक बात पूछना चाहती हूं कि हमारे राजस्थान के गंगानगर में मैंने सुना कि काफी तादाद में आतंकवादियों को हथियार सप्लाई होते हैं। तो क्या आप इसकी जांच कराएंगे ?

श्री के० नटवर सिंह : महोदया, यह सवाल तो आप गृह मंत्रालय के सामने पेश कीजिए। मेरा सवाल तो ई०ई०सी० और हिन्दुस्तान का है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 42.

US Plan to upgrade Pak armed forces

*42. SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA:

SHRI KAPIL VERMA:†

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of documents furnished recently to the U.S. Congress by the U.S. Defence Department unveiling a massive plan to upgrade Pakistan's armed forces; if so, what is Government's reaction thereto; and

(b) whether the issue has been taken up with the U.S. Government; if so, what is the response thereto?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): (a) and (b) In recent testimony in the U.S. Congress, U.S. officials have reiterated the commitment of the U.S. Government to assist in the modernization of Pakistan's armed force. A major portion of the U.S. aid package of U.S. $4.02 billion for

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Kapil Verma.